

Average Continuous Control of Piecewise Deterministic Markov Processes

O.L.V. Costa *

Departamento de Engenharia de Telecomunicações e Controle
Escola Politécnica da Universidade de São Paulo
CEP: 05508 900-São Paulo, Brazil.
e-mail: oswaldo@lac.usp.br

F. Dufour †

Universite Bordeaux I
IMB, Institut Mathématiques de Bordeaux
INRIA Bordeaux Sud Ouest, Team: CQFD
351 cours de la Liberation
33405 Talence Cedex, France
e-mail : dufour@math.u-bordeaux1.fr

Abstract

This paper deals with the long run average continuous control problem of piecewise deterministic Markov processes (PDMP's) taking values in a general Borel space and with compact action space depending on the state variable. The control variable acts on the jump rate and transition measure of the PDMP, and the running and boundary costs are assumed to be positive but not necessarily bounded. Our first main result is to obtain an optimality equation for the long run average cost in terms of a discrete-time optimality equation related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP. Our second main result guarantees the existence of a feedback measurable selector for the discrete-time optimality equation by establishing a connection between this equation and an integro-differential equation. Our final main result is to obtain some sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution for a discrete-time optimality inequality and an ordinary optimal feedback control for the long run average cost using the so-called vanishing discount approach (see [16], page 83).

Keywords: piecewise-deterministic Markov Processes, continuous-time, long-run average cost, optimal control, integro-differential optimality equation, vanishing approach

AMS 2000 subject classification: Primary 60J10

*This author received financial support from CNPq (Brazilian National Research Council), grant 304866/03-2 and FAPESP (Research Council of the State of São Paulo), grant 03/06736-7.

†Author to whom correspondence should be sent.

1 Introduction

A general family of non-diffusion stochastic models suitable for formulating many optimization problems in several areas of operations research, namely piecewise-deterministic Markov processes (PDMP's), was introduced in [6], and [8]. These processes are determined by three local characteristics; the flow ϕ , the jump rate λ and the transition measure Q . Starting from x the motion of the process follows the flow $\phi(x, t)$ until the first jump time T_1 which occurs either spontaneously in a Poisson-like fashion with rate λ or when the flow $\phi(x, t)$ hits the boundary of the state-space. In either case the location of the process at the jump time T_1 is selected by the transition measure $Q(\phi(x, T_1), \cdot)$ and the motion restarts from this new point as before. A suitable choice of the state space and the local characteristics ϕ , λ , and Q provide stochastic models covering a great number of problems of operations research [8].

Closely related to the PDMP's are the so called Markov decision drift processes, introduced by Hordijk and Van der Duyn Shouten, see [18], [19], [20]. Their approach is to analyze the control problems for this class of processes via time-discretizations and deterministic grid approximations of the original process, combined with the theory of Markov Decision Processes. Yushkevich [26, 27] considers similar control problems but adopts a variational approach which yields to some integro differential Bellman optimality inequations and characterization of the value function based on the concept of absolute continuity. By considering some stronger continuity assumptions and under the framework of the PDMP's, Dempster and Ye[9, 10] provide some characterization results for the value function based on a generalized Bellman equation which involves the Clark generalized gradient. There exist two types of control for PDMP's: *continuous control* and *impulse control*. This terminology has been introduced by M.H.A. Davis in [8, page 134] where continuous control is used to describe situations in which the control variable acts at all times on the process through the characteristics (ϕ, λ, Q) by influencing the deterministic motion and the probability of the jumps by opposition to impulse control that intervenes on the process by moving it to a new point of the state space at some times specified by the controller.

This paper deals with the long run average continuous control problem of PDMP's taking values in a general Borel space. At each point x of the state space a control variable is chosen from a compact action set $\mathbb{U}(x)$ and is applied on the jump parameter λ and transition measure Q . The goal is to minimize the long run average cost, which is composed of a running cost and a boundary cost (which is added each time the PDMP touches the boundary). Both costs are assumed to be positive but not necessarily bounded. As far as the authors are aware of, this is the first time that this kind of problem is considered in the literature. Indeed, results are available for the long run average cost problem but for impulse control see Costa [4], Gatarek [14] and the book by M.H.A. Davis [8] (see the references therein). On the other hand, the continuous control problem has been studied only for discounted costs by A. Almudevar [1], M.H.A. Davis [7, 8], M.A.H. Dempster and J.J. Ye [9, 10], Forwick, Schäl, and Schmitz [13], M. Schäl [22], A.A. Yushkevich [27, 28]. The reader may consult the book by M.H.A. Davis [8] and especially the sections at the end of the chapters 4 and 5 for a complete survey on stochastic control problems for PDMP including theoretical results and applications.

Our approach to study the long run average continuous control problem of PDMP's is to follow the idea by M.H.A. Davis and reformulate the optimal control problem of the PDMP as an equivalent discrete-time Markov decision model in which the stages are the jump times T_n . The two main reasons for doing that is to use the powerful tools developed in the discrete-time framework (see for example the references [2, 12, 16, 17]) and to avoid working within the continuous-time context

and the associated infinitesimal generator, which in many situations has its domain difficult to be characterized. For a discounted cost case, the approach adopted by M.H.A. Davis is very natural since the key idea is to re-write the integral cost as a sum of integrals between two consecutive jump times of the PDMP and, by doing this, naturally obtaining the one step cost function for the discrete-time Markov decision model. However, this decomposition for the long run average cost is not possible to be done. Our first main result is to propose another approach for obtaining an optimality equation for the long run average cost. It is shown that (see Theorem 4.1) if there exist a measurable function h , a parameter ρ and a measurable selector satisfying a discrete-time optimality equation related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP, and also that an extra condition involving the function h is verified then an optimal control can be obtained from the measurable selector and ρ is the optimal cost.

Our second main result (see Theorem 6.2) is to remove the hypothesis of the existence of a measurable selector mentioned in the previous theorem and in fact, to guarantee the existence of a feedback measurable selector (that is, a selector that depends on the present value of the state variable, see Remark 3.11) provided that the function h and parameter ρ satisfy the optimality equation. This is done by establishing a link (see the proof Theorem 6.4) between the discrete-time optimality equation and an integro-differential equation (using the weaker concept of absolute continuity along the flow of the value function). The common approach for the existence of a measurable selector is to impose semicontinuity properties of the cost function and to introduce the class of relaxed controls to get a compactness property for the action space. By doing this one obtains an existence result but within the class of relaxed controls. However, what is desired is to show the existence of an optimal control in the class of ordinary controls. Combining the existence result within the class of relaxed controls with the connection between the integro-differential equation and the discrete-time equation we can show that the optimal control is non-relaxed and in fact it is an ordinary feedback control.

In general it is a hard task to get the equality in the solution of the discrete-time optimality equation and verify the extra condition. A common approach to avoid this is to consider an inequality instead of equality for the optimality equation, and to use an Abelian result to get the reverse inequality (see for instance [16]). Our last main result is to obtain some sufficient conditions, based on the value function of the discounted control problems, that guarantee the existence of a solution for the discrete-time optimality inequality using the so-called vanishing approach (see [16], page 83). Combining this result with the link between the integro-differential equation and the discrete-time equation we obtain the existence of an ordinary optimal feedback control for the long run average cost (see Theorem 8.5). In order to do that we need first to establish an optimality equation for the discounted control problem.

A closely related paper to ours, but considering the discounted control case, is the paper by Forwick, Schäl, and Schmitz [13], which also considers unbounded costs and relaxed controls, and obtain sufficient conditions for the existence of ordinary feedback controls. However, in [13] the authors do not consider the long run average cost case neither the related limit problem associated to the vanishing approach. Besides, unlike in [13], we consider here boundary jumps and the control action space depending on the state variable. Note however that control on the flow is not considered here, while it was studied in [13]. Finally it is worth mentioning that the authors are studying in a companion paper the important question of deriving sufficient stability conditions (like those presented in [5], [11]) under which the conditions on the discounted value function used in the vanishing approach are satisfied, tracing a parallel with the discrete-time case (see, for instance, [15, 16]).

The paper is organized in the following way. In section 2 we introduce some notation, basic

assumptions, and the control problems to be considered. The definition of the ordinary and relaxed control spaces as well as some operators required for characterizing the optimality equation are presented in section 3. This section presents several technical measurability results that will be required throughout the paper. The first main result is presented in section 4, Theorem 4.1, which obtains an optimality equation for the long run average cost in terms of a discrete-time optimality equation related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP, and an additional condition. In section 5 we introduce some continuity assumptions on the parameters in order to get some convergence and lower semicontinuity results. In section 6 we derive sufficient conditions for the existence of an ordinary feedback optimal control by establishing a link between the discrete-time optimality equation and an integro-differential equation using the concept of absolute continuity of the value function along the flow (see Theorems 6.2, and 6.4). Section 7 considers the discounted optimal control problem and derive an optimality equation. Our final main result is presented in section 8 with some sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution for the optimality inequality and an ordinary optimal feedback control for the long run average cost using the so-called vanishing discount approach (see Theorem 8.5). In order to facilitate the reading of the paper several proofs of some technical results are presented in the appendix.

2 Notation and assumptions

In this section we present some standard notation and some basic definitions related to the motion of a PDMP $\{X(t)\}$, and the control problems we will consider throughout the paper. For further details and properties the reader is referred to [8]. The following notation will be used in this paper:

- $\mathbb{R}$ denotes the set of real numbers, $\mathbb{R}_+$ the set of positive real numbers and $\mathbb{R}^d$ the d -dimensional euclidian space.
- η denotes the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$.
- For X a metric spaces, we denote $\mathcal{B}(X)$ as the σ -algebra generated by the open sets of X . $\mathcal{M}(X)$ (respectively, $\mathcal{P}(X)$) denotes the set of all finite (respectively probability) measures on $(X, \mathcal{B}(X))$.
- Let X and Y be metric spaces. The set of all Borel measurable (respectively bounded) functions from X into Y is denoted by $\mathbb{M}(X; Y)$ (respectively $\mathbb{B}(X; Y)$). Moreover, for notational simplicity $\mathbb{M}(X)$ (respectively $\mathbb{B}(X)$, $\mathbb{M}(X)^+$, $\mathbb{B}(X)^+$) denotes $\mathbb{M}(X; \mathbb{R})$ (respectively $\mathbb{B}(X; \mathbb{R})$, $\mathbb{M}(X; \mathbb{R}_+)$, $\mathbb{B}(X; \mathbb{R}_+)$). $\mathcal{C}(X)$ denotes the set of continuous functions from X to $\mathbb{R}$. For $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$, h^+ (respectively h^-) denotes the positive (respectively, negative) part of h .

To get a better picture of the motion of a PDMP we first present its definition without any control variable. Let E be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$, ∂E its boundary, and $\overline{E}$ its closure. A PDMP is determined by its local characteristics (ϕ, λ, Q) . The main assumptions and related definitions on these three parameters are presented below:

- the flow $\phi(x, t)$ is a function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ continuous in (x, t) and such that

$$\phi(x, t + s) = \phi(\phi(x, t), s). \quad (1)$$

For each $x \in E$ the time the flow takes to reach the boundary starting from x is defined as

$$t_*(x) \doteq \inf\{t > 0 : \phi(x, t) \in \partial E\}.$$

For $x \in E$ such that $t_*(x) = \infty$ (that is, the flow starting from x never touches the boundary), we set $\phi(x, t_*(x)) = \Delta$, where Δ is a fixed point in ∂E .

Some results that will be derived along the paper will be written in terms of the properties along the flow $\phi(x, t)$. In particular we define the following space of functions absolutely continuous along the flow with limit towards the boundary:

$$\mathbb{M}^{ac}(E) = \left\{ g \in \mathbb{M}(E); g(\phi(x, t)) : [0, t_*(x)) \mapsto \mathbb{R} \text{ is absolutely continuous for each } x \in E \right. \\ \left. \text{and whenever } t_*(x) < \infty \text{ the limit } \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*(x)} g(\phi(x, t)) \text{ exists} \right\}.$$

For $g \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$ and $z \in \partial E$ for which there exists $x \in E$ such that $z = \phi(x, t_*(x))$ where $t_*(x) < \infty$ we define $g(z) = \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*(x)} g(\phi(x, t))$ (note that the limit exists by assumption). As shown in Lemma 9.3, for $g \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$ there exists a function $\mathcal{X}g \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$

$$g(\phi(x, t)) - g(x) = \int_0^t \mathcal{X}g(\phi(x, s)) ds.$$

- the jump rate $\lambda : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ which is assumed to be a measurable function satisfying: $(\forall x \in E)$ $(\exists \varepsilon > 0)$ such that $\int_0^\varepsilon \lambda(\phi(x, s)) ds < \infty$.
- the post-jump location kernel $Q : \overline{E} \times \mathcal{B}(E) \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which is a transition measure satisfying the following property: $(\forall x \in E)$ $Q(x, E - \{x\}) = 1$.

From these characteristics, it can be shown [8, p.62-66] that there exists a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, \{P_x\}_{x \in E})$ such that the motion of the process $\{X(t)\}$ starting from a point $x \in E$ may be constructed as follows. Take a random variable T_1 such that

$$P_x(T_1 > t) \doteq \begin{cases} e^{-\Lambda(x, t)} & \text{for } t < t_*(x) \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq t_*(x) \end{cases}$$

and $t \in [0, t_*(x)[$

$$\Lambda(x, t) \doteq \int_0^t \lambda(\phi(x, s)) ds.$$

If T_1 generated according to the above probability is equal to infinity, then for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $X(t) = \phi(x, t)$. Otherwise select independently an E -valued random variable (labelled X_1) having distribution $Q(\phi(x, T_1), \cdot)$. The trajectory of $\{X(t)\}$ starting at x , for $t \leq T_1$, is given by

$$X(t) \doteq \begin{cases} \phi(x, t) & \text{for } t < T_1, \\ X_1 & \text{for } t = T_1. \end{cases}$$

Starting from $X(T_1) = X_1$, we now select the next inter-jump time $T_2 - T_1$ and post-jump location $X(T_2) = X_2$ in a similar way. This gives a strong Markov process $\{X(t)\}$ with jump times $\{T_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ (where $T_0 \doteq 0$).

We present next the control problems and some basic assumptions we will consider throughout the paper. We suppose from now on that the local characteristics λ and Q depend on a control action $u \in \mathbb{U}$ where $\mathbb{U}$ is a Borel space, in the following way:

- $\lambda \in \mathbb{M}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})^+$.
- Q is a stochastic kernel on E given $\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U}$.

For each $x \in \overline{E}$ we define the subsets $\mathbb{U}(x)$ of $\mathbb{U}$ as the set of feasible control actions that can be taken when the state process is in $x \in \overline{E}$, that is, the control action that will be applied to λ and Q must belong to $\mathbb{U}(x)$. The following assumptions, based on the standard theory of Markov decision processes (see [16]), will be made throughout the paper:

Assumption 2.1 For all $x \in \overline{E}$, $\mathbb{U}(x)$ is a compact subspace of $\mathbb{U}$.

Assumption 2.2 The set $K = \{(x, a) : x \in \overline{E}, a \in \mathbb{U}(x)\}$ is a Borel subset of $\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U}$.

The following assumption will also be required along the paper:

Assumption 2.3 For all $x \in E$, and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$, $\int_0^t \sup_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), a) ds < \infty$.

If $t_*(x) < \infty$ then $\int_0^{t_*(x)} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), a) ds < \infty$.

We present next the definition of an admissible control strategy and the associated motion of the controlled process. A control policy U is a pair of functions $(u, u_\partial) \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{U}) \times \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{N} \times E; \mathbb{U})$ satisfying $u(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))$, and $u_\partial(n, x) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))$ for all $(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+$. The class of admissible control strategy will be denoted by $\mathcal{U}$.

Given a control strategy $U = (u, u_\partial)$, one describe the motion of the piecewise deterministic process $X(t)$ in the following manner. Define $T_0 = 0$ and $X(0) = x$. Assume that the process $\{X(t)\}$ is located at Z_n at the n^{th} jump time T_n then select a random variable S_n having distribution

$$F(t) = 1 - I_{\{t < t_*(Z_n)\}} e^{-\int_0^t \lambda(\phi(Z_n, s), u(n, Z_n, s)) ds}.$$

Define $T_{n+1} = T_n + S_n$ and for $t \in [T_n, T_{n+1})$, $X(t) = \phi(Z_n, t - T_n)$.

Let Z_{n+1} a random variable having distribution $Q(\phi(Z_n, T_{n+1}), u(n, Z_n, S_n)); \cdot)$ if $\phi(Z_n, T_{n+1}) \in E$ or $Q(\phi(Z_n, T_{n+1}), u_\partial(n, Z_n); \cdot)$ if $\phi(Z_n, T_{n+1}) \in \partial E$.

At time T_{n+1} , the process $\{X(t)\}$ is defined by $X(T_{n+1}) = Z_{n+1}$.

Now we give a more precise definition of the controlled piecewise deterministic Markov process described above. Consider the state space $\hat{E} = E \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{N}$. For a control policy $U = (u, u_\partial)$ let us introduce the following parameters for $\hat{x} = (x, z, s, n) \in \hat{E}$:

- the flow $\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t) = (\phi(x, t), z, s + t, n)$.
- the jump rate $\hat{\lambda}^U(\hat{x}) = \lambda(x, u(n, z, s))$.
- the transition measure

$$\hat{Q}^U(\hat{x}, A \times B \times \{0\} \times \{n+1\}) = \begin{cases} Q(x, u(n, z, s)); A \cap B & \text{if } x \in E, \\ Q(x, u_\partial(n, z); A \cap B) & \text{if } x \in \partial E, \end{cases}$$

for A and B in $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

From [8, section 25], it can be shown that for any control strategy $U = (u, u_\partial) \in \mathcal{U}$ there exists a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}, \{P_{\hat{x}}^U\}_{\hat{x} \in \hat{E}})$ such that the piecewise deterministic Markov process $\{\hat{X}^U(t)\}$ with local characteristics $(\hat{\phi}, \hat{\lambda}^U, \hat{Q}^U)$ may be constructed as follows. For notational

simplicity the probability $P_{\hat{x}_0}^U$ will be denoted by $P_{(x,k)}^U$ for $\hat{x}_0 = (x, x, 0, k) \in \hat{E}$. Take a random variable T_1 such that

$$P_{(x,k)}^U(T_1 > t) \doteq \begin{cases} e^{-\Lambda^U(x,k,t)} & \text{for } t < t_*(x) \\ 0 & \text{for } t \geq t_*(x) \end{cases}$$

where for $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, t_*(x)[$

$$\Lambda^U(x, k, t) \doteq \int_0^t \lambda(\phi(x, s), u(k, x, s)) ds.$$

If T_1 is equal to infinity, then for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\hat{X}^U(t) = (\phi(x, t), x, t, 0)$. Otherwise select independently an $\hat{E}$ -valued random variable (labelled $\hat{X}_1^U$) having distribution

$$P_{(x,k)}^U(\hat{X}_1^U \in A \times B \times \{0\} \times \{k+1\} | \sigma\{T_1\}) = \begin{cases} Q(\phi(x, T_1), u(k, x, T_1)); A \cap B & \text{if } \phi(x, T_1) \in E, \\ Q(\phi(x, T_1), u_\partial(k, x); A \cap B) & \text{if } \phi(x, T_1) \in \partial E. \end{cases}$$

The trajectory of $\{\hat{X}^U(t)\}$ starting from $(x, x, 0, k)$, for $t \leq T_1$, is given by

$$\hat{X}^U(t) \doteq \begin{cases} (\phi(x, t), x, t, 0) & \text{for } t < T_1, \\ \hat{X}_1^U & \text{for } t = T_1. \end{cases}$$

Starting from $\hat{X}^U(T_1) = \hat{X}_1^U$, we now select the next inter-jump time $T_2 - T_1$ and post-jump location $\hat{X}^U(T_2) = \hat{X}_2^U$ in a similar way.

Let us define the components of the PDMP $\{\hat{X}^U(t)\}$ by $\hat{X}^U(t) = (X(t), Z(t), \tau(t), N(t))$. From the previous construction of the PDMP $\{\hat{X}^U(t)\}$, it is easy to see that $X(t)$ corresponds to the trajectory of the system, $Z(t)$ is the value of $X(t)$ at the last jump time before t , $\tau(t)$ is time elapsed between the last jump and time t , and $N(t)$ is the number of jumps of the process $\{X(t)\}$ at time t .

As in Davis [8], we consider the following assumption to avoid any accumulation point of the jump times:

Assumption 2.4 For any $x \in E$, $U = (u, u_\partial) \in \mathcal{U}$, and $t \geq 0$, $E_{(x,0)}^U \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} I_{\{T_i \leq t\}} \right] < \infty$

The costs of our control problem will contain two terms, a running cost f and a boundary cost r , satisfying the following properties:

Assumption 2.5 $f \in \mathbb{M}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})^+$.

Assumption 2.6 $r \in \mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})^+$.

The long-run average cost we want to minimize over $\mathcal{U}$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}(U, x) = & \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} E_{(x,0)}^U \left[\int_0^t f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) ds \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^t r(X(s-), u_\partial(N(s-), Z(s-))) dp^*(s) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $p^*(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} I_{\{T_i \leq t\}} I_{\{X(T_i-) \in \partial E\}}$ counts the number of times the process hits the boundary up to time t , and we set

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{A}(U, x). \quad (3)$$

For the α discounted case, with $\alpha > 0$, the cost we want to minimize is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^{\alpha}(U, x) = E_{(x,0)}^U & \left[\int_0^{\infty} e^{-\alpha s} f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) ds \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), u_{\partial}(N(s-), Z(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

and we set

$$\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}(x) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{D}^{\alpha}(U, x). \quad (5)$$

We also consider a truncated version of problem (5) defined, for each $m = 0, 1, \dots$, as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_m^{\alpha}(U, x) = E_{(x,0)}^U & \left[\int_0^{T_m} e^{-\alpha s} f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) ds \right. \\ & \left. + \int_0^{T_m} e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), u_{\partial}(N(s-), Z(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

We need the following assumption, to avoid infinite costs for the discounted case.

Assumption 2.7 For all $\alpha > 0$ and all $x \in E$, $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}(x) < \infty$.

It is clear that for all $x \in E$, $0 \leq \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{D}_m^{\alpha}(U, x) \leq \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{D}}^{\alpha}(x) < \infty$.

Remark 2.8 There is no loss of generality in assuming that $\mathbb{U}$ is compact. Indeed, if $\mathbb{U}$ is a Borel space, it follows from Proposition 7 in [29] that $\mathbb{U}$ can be considered as a measurable subset of a compact space $\mathbb{U}'$ where $\mathbb{U}(x)$ is compact in $\mathbb{U}'$ for $x \in \overline{E}$. Moreover, by recalling that $\mathbb{U}(x)$ represents the set of feasible controls in the state $x \in \overline{E}$, the definition of the control problem will not be affected if the functions λ , Q , f , and r are extended to $\mathbb{U}'$. Therefore, from now on one will assume that $\mathbb{U}$ is compact. This result will be needed in sub-section 3.1

3 Discrete-time ordinary and relaxed controls

The class of open loop policies denoted by $\mathcal{U}$ has been introduced in the previous section as the set of admissible control strategies for a PDMP. As mentioned in the introduction we will study in section 4 how the original continuous-time control problem can be associated to an optimality equation of a discrete-time problem related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP. In this section we first present the definitions of the discrete-time ordinary and relaxed control sets used in the formulation of the optimality equation of the discrete-time Markov control problem as well as the characterization of some topological properties of these sets. In particular, by using a result of the theory of multifunctions (see the book by Castaing and Valadier [3]), it is shown that the set of relaxed controls is compact. In the sequel we present some important operators associated to the optimality equation of the discrete-time problem as well as some measurability properties.

3.1 Relaxed and ordinary control

We present in this sub-section the set of discrete-time relaxed controls and the subset of ordinary controls. Consider the Banach spaces $L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}))$ and $L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{U}))$ where $\mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U})$ is equipped with the topology of uniform convergence and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{U})$ is equipped with the weak* topology $\sigma(\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{U}), \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}))$. Let $\mathcal{V}^r$ (respectively $\mathcal{V}^r(x)$ for $x \in E$) be the set of all η -measurable functions μ defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$ with value in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U})$ such that $\mu(t, \mathbb{U}) = 1$ η -a.e. (respectively $\mu(t, \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))) = 1$ η -a.e.). From Theorem V-2 in [3], it follows that $\mathcal{V}^r$ (respectively $\mathcal{V}^r(x)$ for $x \in E$) are compact sets with respect to the weak* topology $\sigma(L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{U})), L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U})))$. Moreover, from Bishop's Theorem (see Theorem I.3.11 in [23]), there is a metric such for all $x \in E$, $\mathcal{V}^r(x)$ is a compact set of the Borel set $\mathcal{V}^r$. Note that a sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{V}^r(x)$ converges to μ if and only if

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))} g(t, u) \mu_n(t, du) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))} g(t, u) \mu(t, du) dt, \quad (7)$$

for all $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}))$.

Therefore, the set of relaxed controls are defined as follows. For $x \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}^r(x) &= \mathcal{V}^r(x) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))) , \\ \mathbb{V}^r &= \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}). \end{aligned}$$

The set of ordinary controls, denoted by $\mathbb{V}$ (respectively $\mathbb{V}(x)$ for $x \in E$), is defined as above except that it is composed of deterministic functions instead of probability measures. More specifically we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(x) &= \left\{ \nu \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{U}) : (\forall t \in \mathbb{R}_+), \nu(t) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t)) \right\}, \\ \mathbb{V}(x) &= \mathcal{V}(x) \times \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x))), \\ \mathbb{V} &= \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{U}) \times \mathbb{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the set of ordinary controls is a subset of the set of relaxed controls $\mathbb{V}^r$ (respectively $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ for $x \in E$) by identifying any control action $u \in \mathbb{U}$ with the Dirac measure concentrated on u . Thus we can write that $\mathbb{V} \subset \mathbb{V}^r$ (respectively $\mathbb{V}(x) \subset \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ for $x \in E$) and from now on we will consider that $\mathbb{V}$ (respectively $\mathbb{V}(x)$ for $x \in E$) will be endowed with the topology generated by $\mathbb{V}^r$.

The necessity to introduce the class of relaxed control $\mathbb{V}^r$ is justified by the fact that in general there does not exist a topology for which $\mathbb{V}$ and $\mathbb{V}(x)$ are compact sets. However from the previous construction, it follows that $\mathbb{V}^r$ and $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ are compact sets.

We present next a definition that will be useful in the next sections.

Definition 3.1 For any $x \in E$, $t \in [0, t_*(x))$, and $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$, define

$$[\Theta]_t = (\mu(\cdot + t), \mu_\partial). \quad (8)$$

Clearly, $[\Theta]_t \in \mathbb{V}^r(\phi(x, t))$.

As in [16], page 14, we need that the set of feasible state/relaxed-control pairs is a measurable subset of $\mathcal{B}(E) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{V}^r)$, that is, we need the following assumption.

Assumption 3.2

$$\mathcal{K} \doteq \{(x, \Theta) : \Theta \in \mathbb{V}^r(x), x \in E\} \in \mathcal{B}(E) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{V}^r)$$

We present a sufficient condition, based on the continuity of the sets $\mathbb{U}(x)$, to ensure that assumption 3.2 holds. The proof is presented in the appendix.

Proposition 3.3 *Assumption 3.2 is satisfied if for all convergent sequence $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in E*

$$\mathbb{U}(x) = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcup_{m \geq n} \mathbb{U}(x_m) = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \bigcap_{m \geq n} \mathbb{U}(x_m),$$

where $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$.

3.2 Discrete-time operators and measurability properties

In this sub-section we present some important operators associated to the optimality equation of the discrete-time problem as well as some measurability properties.

We consider the following notation for $x \in \overline{E}$, $y \in E$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U})$, $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$, and $w \in \mathbb{M}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})^+$:

$$\begin{aligned} Qh(x, \mu) &= \int_{\mathbb{U}} \int_E h(z) Q(x, u; dz) \mu(du), & \lambda Qh(x, \mu) &= \int_{\mathbb{U}} \lambda(x, u) \int_E h(z) Q(x, u; dz) \mu(du), \\ \Lambda^\mu(y, t) &= \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{U}} \lambda(\phi(y, s), u) \mu(du) ds, & w(x, \mu) &= \int_{\mathbb{U}} w(x, u) \mu(du). \end{aligned}$$

The following operators will be associated to the optimality equations of the discrete-time problems that will be presented in the next sections. For $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r$, $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, let us introduce the following stochastic kernel defined on $E \times \mathcal{B}(E)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} G_\alpha(x, \Theta; A) &\doteq \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} \lambda Q I_A(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^\mu(x, t_*(x))} Q(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu_\partial; A), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

for all $(x, A) \in E \times \mathcal{B}(E)$, and so for $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$, we define $G_\alpha h(x, \Theta) \doteq \int_E h(y) G_\alpha(x, \Theta; dy)$. For $x \in E$, $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r$, $v \in \mathbb{M}(E \times \mathbb{U})^+$, $w \in \mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, introduce

$$L_\alpha v(x, \Theta) \doteq \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} v(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds, \tag{10}$$

$$H_\alpha w(x, \Theta) \doteq e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^\mu(x, t_*(x))} w(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu_\partial). \tag{11}$$

For $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ (respectively, $v \in \mathbb{M}(E \times \mathbb{U})$), $G_\alpha h(x, \Theta) = G_\alpha h^+(x, \Theta) - G_\alpha h^-(x, \Theta)$ (respectively, $L_\alpha v(x, \Theta) = L_\alpha v^+(x, \Theta) - L_\alpha v^-(x, \Theta)$) provided the difference has a meaning. It will be useful in the sequel to define the function $\mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta)$ as follows: $\mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) \doteq L_\alpha I_{E \times \mathbb{U}}(x, \Theta)$. In particular for $\alpha = 0$ we write for simplicity $G_0 = G$, $L_0 = L$, $H_0 = H$, $\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}$.

The next proposition presents some important measurability properties of the operators G_α , L_α , and H_α (defined in equations (9), (10), and (11)) and its proof can be found in the appendix.

Proposition 3.4 *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below, $w_1 \in \mathbb{M}(E \times \mathbb{U})$ be bounded from below, and $w_2 \in \mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})$. Then the mappings $G_\alpha g(x, \Theta)$, $L_\alpha w_1(x, \Theta)$, and $H_\alpha w_2(x, \Theta)$ defined on $E \times \mathbb{V}^r$ with values in $\mathbb{R}$ are $\mathcal{B}(E \times \mathbb{V}^r)$ -measurable.*

We present now the definitions of the one-stage optimization operators.

Definition 3.5 For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ bounded from below, define

i) the (ordinary) one-stage optimization operator by

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, g)(x) = \inf_{\Upsilon \in \mathbb{V}(x)} \left\{ -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Upsilon) + L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + G_\alpha g(x, \Upsilon) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

ii) the relaxed one-stage optimization operator by

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, g)(x) = \inf_{\Theta \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)} \left\{ -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) + L_\alpha f(x, \Theta) + H_\alpha r(x, \Theta) + G_\alpha g(x, \Theta) \right\}. \quad (13)$$

In particular for $\alpha = 0$ we write for simplicity $\mathcal{T}_0 = \mathcal{T}$, and $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{R}$.

Let us introduce the following sets of measurable selectors associated to $(\mathbb{U}(x))_{x \in E}$ (respectively $(\mathbb{V}(x))_{x \in E}$, $(\mathbb{V}^r(x))_{x \in E}$):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}} &= \left\{ u \in \mathbb{M}(\overline{E}, \mathbb{U}) : (\forall x \in \overline{E}), u(x) \in \mathbb{U}(x) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}} &= \left\{ (\nu, \nu_\partial) \in \mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{V}) : (\forall x \in E), (\nu(x), \nu_\partial(x)) \in \mathbb{V}(x) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r} &= \left\{ (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{M}(E, \mathbb{V}^r) : (\forall x \in E), (\mu(x), \mu_\partial(x)) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.6 The set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ characterizes the control law $u(x)$ that only depends on the value of the state variable x . On the other hand $(\nu, \nu_\partial) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$ characterizes an ordinary control law for the control problem associated to the one-stage optimization operator. Indeed, starting from x , it defines the control law for all $t \in [0, t_*(x))$ through the function $\nu(x, t)$ and at $t = t_*(x)$ (if $t_*(x) < \infty$) through ν_∂ . Finally $(\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r}$ characterizes a relaxed control law for the control problem associated to the relaxed one-stage optimization operator. Since starting from x , it defines a probability over the feasible control actions for all $t \in [0, t_*(x))$ through the probability measure $\mu(x, t)$ and at $t = t_*(x)$ (if $t_*(x) < \infty$) through the probability measure μ_∂ .

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ bounded from below, the one-stage optimization problem associated to the operator $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, g)$, respectively $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, g)$, consists of finding a measurable selector $\Upsilon \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$, respectively $\Theta \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r}$ such that for all $x \in E$

$$\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, g)(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Upsilon(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon(x)) + G_\alpha g(x, \Upsilon(x)),$$

respectively

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, g)(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \Theta(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \Theta(x)) + G_\alpha g(x, \Theta(x)).$$

Finally we conclude this section by showing that there exist two natural mappings from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$ and from $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ to $\mathcal{U}$

Definition 3.7 For $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$, define the mapping $u_\phi : x \rightarrow (u(\phi(x, \cdot)), u(\phi(x, t_*(x))))$ of the space E into $\mathbb{V}$

Proposition 3.8 *If $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ then $u_{\phi} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$.*

Proof: From Lemma A.3 in [13] and item (i) of Lemma 3 in [25] it follows that the mapping $x \rightarrow u(\phi(x, \cdot))$ of the space E into $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{U})$ is measurable. Moreover, for all $(x, t) \in E \times \mathbb{R}_+$, $u(\phi(x, t)) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))$. Therefore, u_{ϕ} belongs to $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$. $\square$

Definition 3.9 *For $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$, define the mapping $U_{\phi} : (n, x, t) \rightarrow (u(\phi(x, t)), u(\phi(x, t_*(x))))$ of the space $\mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+$ into $\mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{U}$.*

Proposition 3.10 *If $u \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ then $U_{\phi} \in \mathcal{U}$.*

Proof: This is a straightforward consequence of the measurability properties of u and ϕ and the fact that $u(x) \in \mathbb{U}(x)$. $\square$

Remark 3.11 *The measurable selectors of the kind u_{ϕ} as in Definition 3.7 are called feedback measurable selectors in the class $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}} \subset \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^*}$ and the control strategies of the kind U_{ϕ} as in definition 3.9 are called feedback control strategies in the class $\mathcal{U}$.*

4 Discrete-time optimality equation for the average control

In this section we obtain an optimality equation for the long run average cost problem defined in equation (3) in terms of a discrete-time optimality equation related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP, and an additional condition on a limit over the solution of the optimality equation divided by the time t . Notice that in this section we will be assuming that there is an optimal solution for the one-stage optimization problem, and therefore we will be dealing with the ordinary action sets (that is, $\mathbb{V}(x)$).

Theorem 4.1 *Suppose that there exists a pair $(\rho, h) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{M}(E)$ with h bounded from below satisfying the following discrete-time optimality equation*

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x) = h(x), \quad (14)$$

and for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow +\infty} E_{(x,0)}^U \left[h(X(t \wedge T_m)) \right] = 0. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, assume that there exists a solution to the one-stage optimization problem associated to $\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)$, that is, the existence of an optimal measurable selector $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}_{\partial})$ in $\mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$ such that for all $x \in E$

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + Lf(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + Hr(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + Gh(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)), \quad (16)$$

Define the control strategy $\hat{U}$ by $(\hat{u}, \hat{u}_{\partial})$ with $\hat{u}(n, x, t) = \hat{\gamma}(x, t)$, $\hat{u}_{\partial}(n, x) = \hat{\gamma}_{\partial}(x)$ for $(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+$. Then $\hat{U}$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$ and it is optimal. Moreover,

$$\rho = \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{A}}(x) = \mathcal{A}(\hat{U}, x).$$

The proof of this theorem is presented at the end of this section.

In Theorem 4.1 notice that equation (14) can be seen as the optimality equation of a discrete-time problem related to the embedded Markov chain given by the post-jump location of the PDMP with transition kernel G , and equation (15) as an additional technical condition.

Notice that in general, one cannot guarantee the existence of an optimal measurable selector for the optimality equation (14) without compactness conditions. This problem of existence will be considered in the next section.

In order to prove the previous theorem we first need to present several intermediate results that will also be used in the remainder of the paper. Notice that these results will be written in terms of an extra parameter $\alpha \geq 0$ that will be useful for the discounted control problem analyzed in sections 7 and 8. The proofs of these intermediate results can be found in the appendix.

The next proposition presents some important properties of the one-stage optimality equation (see equations (17), (18)). It is shown that the solution of the one-stage optimality equation has a special time representation (see equation (19)). As a consequence it follows that it is absolutely continuous along trajectories with limit on the boundary (that is, it belongs to $\mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$).

Proposition 4.2 *Let $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below. For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $x \in E$ define*

$$w(x) = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x). \quad (17)$$

Assume that $w \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ and there exists $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathcal{S}_V$ such that

$$w(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)). \quad (18)$$

Then $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$ and for all $x \in E$, and $t \in [0, t_(x))$,*

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\gamma}(x)}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\gamma}(x, s)) + \lambda Q h(\phi(x, s), \hat{\gamma}(x, s)) \right] ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\hat{\gamma}(x)}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \inf_{\nu \in \mathcal{V}(x)} \left\{ \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\nu(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) + \lambda Q h(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) \right] ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\nu(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}(x) = (\hat{\gamma}(x), \hat{\gamma}_\partial(x))$.

The next two propositions deal with two inequalities of opposite directions for the one-stage optimality equation. Roughly speaking these two results show that if h is a solution for a one-stage optimality inequality (see (21) or (23)) then this inequality is preserved, in one case for any control strategy and in the other case for a specific control strategy, along the jump time iterations for a cost conveniently defined, see equations (22) or (24).

Proposition 4.3 Let $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below. For $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, assume that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h) \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ and there exists $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}_\partial) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ such that for all $x \in E$

$$h(x) \leq \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)). \quad (21)$$

For $U \in \mathcal{U}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$, define

$$J_m^U(t, x, k) = E_{(x, k)}^U \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} \left[f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) - \rho \right] ds \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), u_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) + e^{-\alpha(t \wedge T_m)} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(X(t \wedge T_m)) \right].$$

Then for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$J_m^U(t, x, k) \geq h(x). \quad (22)$$

The next proposition considers the reverse inequality.

Proposition 4.4 Let $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below. For $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, assume that $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h) \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ and there exists $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}_\partial) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ such that for all $x \in E$

$$h(x) \geq \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)). \quad (23)$$

Then for $\hat{U}$ defined by $(\hat{u}, \hat{u}_\partial)$ with $\hat{u}(n, x, t) = \hat{\gamma}(x, t)$, and $\hat{u}_\partial(n, x) = \hat{\gamma}_\partial(x)$ for $(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+$, we have that $\hat{U}$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. Moreover, defining

$$J_m^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) = E_{(x, k)}^{\hat{U}} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} \left[f(X(s), \hat{u}(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) - \rho \right] ds \right. \\ \left. + \int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), \hat{u}_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) + e^{-\alpha(t \wedge T_m)} \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(X(t \wedge T_m)) \right],$$

we have, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$, that

$$J_m^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) \leq h(x). \quad (24)$$

Combining the previous propositions with $\alpha = 0$ we get the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1: From Proposition 4.3 it follows that

$$E_{(x, 0)}^U \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_m} f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) ds + \int_0^{t \wedge T_m} r(X(s-), u_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ + E_{(x, 0)}^U \left[h(X(t \wedge T_m)) \right] \geq E_{(x, 0)}^U \left[\rho[t \wedge T_m] \right] + h(x).$$

Consequently we have, from assumption 2.4 (which implies that $T_m \rightarrow \infty$ P^U a.s.), that

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} E_{(x, 0)}^U \left[\int_0^t f(X(s), u(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) ds + \int_0^t r(X(s-), u_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ + \overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow +\infty} E_{(x, 0)}^U \left[h(X(t \wedge T_m)) \right] \geq \rho,$$

showing that $\rho \leq \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{A}(x)$, by using equation (15).

From Proposition 4.4, the control strategy $\hat{U}$ defined by $(\hat{u}, \hat{u}_\partial)$ with $\hat{u}(n, x, t) = \hat{\gamma}(x, t)$, $\hat{u}_\partial(n, x) = \hat{\gamma}_\partial(x)$ for $(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$. Combining equations (15) and (24) we obtain that $\rho \geq \mathcal{A}(\hat{U}, x)$ completing the proof. $\square$

5 Convergence and lower semicontinuity properties

In the previous section we assumed the existence of an ordinary optimal measurable selector for the one-stage optimization problem associated to $\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)$ (see equation (16)), for (ρ, h) satisfying the optimality equation $\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x) = h(x)$. In the next sections we will suppress this hypothesis. In order to do that we need to consider relaxed controls, so that we can take advantage of the compactness property of the sets $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ and $\mathbb{V}^r$ as presented in section 3. Note however that we also need the cost function to be lower semicontinuous. Thus in this section we present the assumptions and results that will guarantee some convergence and lower semicontinuity properties of the operators G_α , L_α , and H_α that appear in the one-stage optimization operators with respect to the topology defined in equation (7). Combining the compactness of the sets $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ with the lower semicontinuity of the operators G_α , L_α , and H_α we can use the measurable selector theorem as presented in Proposition D.5 of [16] to get the existence of a relaxed optimal control and measurability of the one-stage optimization equation. Moreover in parallel we get some important convergence properties that will be applied with the vanishing approach in section 8.

From now on we will consider the following assumptions.

Assumption 5.1 *For each $x \in E$, $\lambda(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{U}(x) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is continuous.*

Assumption 5.2 *There exists a sequence of measurable functions $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{M}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})^+$ such that for all $y \in \overline{E}$, $f_j(y, \cdot) \uparrow f(y, \cdot)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and $f_j(y, \cdot) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}(y))$.*

Assumption 5.3 *There exists a sequence of measurable functions $(r_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})^+$ such that for all $z \in \partial E$, $r_j(z, \cdot) \uparrow r(z, \cdot)$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$ and $r_j(z, \cdot) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}(z))$.*

Assumption 5.4 *For all $x \in \overline{E}$ and $g \in \mathbb{B}(E)$, $Qg(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{U}(x) \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is continuous.*

Assumption 5.5 *There exists $\xi \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$, such that*

- a) $\lambda(y, a) \geq \xi(y)$ for all $y \in E$ and $a \in \mathbb{U}(y)$,
- b) $\int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} dt \leq K_\xi < \infty$ for all $x \in E$,
- c) $\int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))} f(\phi(x, t), a) dt < \infty$.

Remark 5.6 *A consequence of Assumption 5.5 b) is that $\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\alpha t - \int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} = 0$, for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $x \in E$ with $t_*(x) = +\infty$. Therefore, for any $x \in E$ with $t_*(x) = +\infty$, $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$, $w \in \mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})$, $G_\alpha(x, \Theta; A) = \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \int_0^s \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} \lambda Q I_A(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds$, and $H_\alpha w(x, \Theta) = 0$.*

The next proposition presents convergence results of the operators G_α , L_α , and H_α with respect to the topology defined in equation (7). Note that the convergence is taken not only with respect to a sequence of controls but also with respect to some functions and the parameter α . This is justified by the fact we will need this convergence for the vanishing approach in section 8. The proof of the proposition is in the appendix.

Proposition 5.7 Consider $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and a non increasing sequence of positive numbers $\{\alpha_k\}$, $\alpha_k \downarrow \alpha$, a sequence of functions $h_{\alpha_k} \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ uniformly bounded from below by a positive constant K_h (that is, $h_{\alpha_k}(y) \geq -K_h$ for all $y \in E$). Set $h = \varliminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_{\alpha_k}$. For $x \in E$, consider $\Theta_n = (\mu_n, \mu_{\partial,n}) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ and $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_{\partial}) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ such that $\Theta_n \rightarrow \Theta$. We have the following results:

- a) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha_n}(x, \Theta_n) = \mathcal{L}(x, \Theta)$.
- b) $\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n} f(x, \Theta_n) \geq Lf(x, \Theta)$.
- c) $\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{\alpha_n} r(x, \Theta_n) \geq Hr(x, \Theta)$.
- d) $\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_{\alpha_n} h_{\alpha_n}(x, \Theta_n) \geq Gh(x, \Theta)$.

The lower semicontinuity properties mentioned at the beginning of this section follow easily from this proposition as stated in the next corollary.

Corollary 5.8 Consider $h \in \mathcal{M}(E)$ bounded from below. We have the following results:

- a) $\mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(x, \Theta)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$.
- b) $L_{\alpha} f(x, \Theta)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$.
- c) $H_{\alpha} r(x, \Theta)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$.
- d) $G_{\alpha} h(x, \Theta)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$.

Proof: By taking $\alpha_k = \alpha \geq 0$, $h_{\alpha_k} = h$ in Proposition 5.7 the results follow. $\square$

6 Existence of an ordinary optimal feedback control

The main result of this section is the Theorem 6.2 that strengthens Theorem 4.1 of the previous section by only assuming that the discrete-time optimality equation $\mathcal{T}(\rho, h) = h$ has a solution in order to ensure the existence of an optimal control strategy for the long run average control problem. Moreover, it is shown that this optimal control strategy is in the feedback class and can be characterized as in item D3) of the Definition 6.1. These results are obtained by establishing a connection (see the proof Theorem 6.4) between the discrete-time optimality equation and an integro-differential equation (using the weaker concept of absolute continuity along the flow of the value function). The basic idea is to use the set of relaxed controls $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$. The advantage of considering $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ is that it is compact so that, together with the assumptions we have made in section 5, we can apply a measurable selector theorem to guarantee the existence of an optimal measurable selector (see Proposition 6.3). The price to pay is that this measurable selector belongs to the space of relaxed controls. However we can show that in fact there exists a non-relaxed feedback selector for the discrete-time optimality equation $\mathcal{T}(\rho, h) = h$ by establishing a connection between the discrete-time optimality equation and the integro-differential equation (see the proof of Theorem 6.4).

Definition 6.1 Consider $w \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ and $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ bounded from below.

D1) Denote by $\widehat{u}(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ the measurable selector satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(x)} \{f(x, a) - \lambda(x, a) [w(x) - Qh(x, a)]\} \\ &= f(x, \widehat{u}(w, h)(x)) - \lambda(x, \widehat{u}(w, h)(x)) [w(x) - Qh(x, \widehat{u}(w, h)(x))], \\ & \inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(z)} \{r(z, a) + Qh(z, a)\} = r(z, \widehat{u}(w, h)(z)) + Qh(z, \widehat{u}(w, h)(z)). \end{aligned}$$

D2) $\widehat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$ is the measurable selector derived from $\widehat{u}(w, h)$ through the definition 3.7.

D3) $\widehat{U}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{U}$ is the control strategy derived from $\widehat{u}(w, h)$ through the definition 3.9.

The existence of $\widehat{u}(w, h)$ follows from assumptions 5.1-5.4 and Theorem 3.3.5 in [16] and the fact that $\widehat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}}$, and $\widehat{U}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{U}$ comes from Propositions 3.8 and 3.10.

Theorem 6.2 Suppose that there exists a pair $(\rho, h) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{M}(E)$ with h bounded from below satisfying the following discrete-time optimality equation

$$\mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x) = h(x),$$

and for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{t \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{t} \overline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow +\infty} E_{(x,0)}^U [h(X(t \wedge T_m))] = 0.$$

Then $h \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$, the feedback optimal control strategy $\widehat{U}_\phi(h, h)$ (see item D3) of Definition 6.1) is optimal, and

$$\rho = \mathcal{J}_A(x) = \mathcal{A}(\widehat{U}(h, h), x).$$

Proof: The proof of this result is straightforward by combining Theorem 4.1 of the previous section and Theorem 6.4 presented below. $\square$

The proof of the next proposition is presented in the appendix. It shows the existence of an optimal relaxed measurable selector for the relaxed one-stage optimization operator $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x)$ and that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h) \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$.

Proposition 6.3 Let $\alpha \geq 0$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below. For $x \in E$ define $w(x) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x)$. Assume that for all $x \in E$, $w(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then there exists $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r}$ such that

$$w(x) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)). \quad (25)$$

Moreover, $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$, and satisfies for all $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{V}^r(x)} \left\{ \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) \right] ds \right. \\ &\quad \left. + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) \right] ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $\hat{\Theta}(x) = (\hat{\mu}(x), \hat{\mu}_\partial(x))$.

The following theorem shows the existence of a feedback measurable selector for the one-stage optimization problems associated to $\mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)$ and $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)$. Its proof is presented in the appendix.

Theorem 6.4 *Let $\alpha \geq 0$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ be bounded from below. For $x \in E$ define*

$$w(x) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x), \quad (28)$$

and suppose that $w(x) \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $x \in E$. Then $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$ and the feedback measurable selector $\hat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ (see item D2) of Definition 6.1) satisfies the following one-stage optimization problems:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) &= \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) \\ &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

7 Optimality equation for the discounted case

In this section we consider the discounted optimal control problem (5) and, under the assumptions made in the previous sections, we derive an optimality equation for this problem. As usual in this kind of problem we characterize first the optimality equation for the truncated on the jump times T_m problems (6) and then take the limit as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

Throughout this section we consider $\alpha > 0$ fixed. For any $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$, we set $\mathcal{W}g$ as the function on E defined as

$$\mathcal{W}g(x) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(0, g)(x), \quad (30)$$

for $x \in E$. The following proposition is an immediate consequence of the results derived in the previous section.

Proposition 7.1 *For $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$ consider $w = \mathcal{W}g$ and suppose that for all $x \in E$, $w(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $w \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$ and $\hat{u}_\phi(w, g) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ (see item D2) of Definition 6.1) satisfies*

$$w(x) = L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, g)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, g)(x)) + G_\alpha g(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, g)(x)). \quad (31)$$

Proof: From Theorem 6.4, we obtain the first equality and that $\hat{u}_\phi(w, g)$ satisfies equation (31). Now applying Proposition 3.4 and by using the fact that $f \in \mathbb{M}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})^+$ and $r \in \mathbb{M}(\partial E \times \mathbb{U})^+$, we obtain that $\mathcal{W}g \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$. $\square$

Define the sequence of functions $(v_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$v_{m+1} = \mathcal{W}v_m, \quad v_0 = 0, \quad (32)$$

We have the following proposition.

Proposition 7.2 *For all $x \in E$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $v_m(x) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{D}_m^\alpha(U, x)$.*

Proof: It follows from the same lines as the proof of the Propositions 4.3 and 4.4. $\square$

Since $v_m(x) = \inf_{U \in \mathcal{U}} \mathcal{D}_m^\alpha(U, x) \leq \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{D}^\alpha(x)$, the functions $v_m \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$ and are non-decreasing. Consequently, there exists $v \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$ such that $v_m \uparrow v$, and it follows that $v \leq \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{D}^\alpha$. We need the following propositions:

Proposition 7.3 *If $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)^+$ is such that $h(x) \geq \mathcal{W}h(x)$ then $h(x) \geq \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x)$.*

Proof: By using Theorem 6.4 with $\rho = 0$, we obtain that there exists $\hat{u}_\phi \in \mathcal{S}_V$ such that

$$h(x) \geq \mathcal{T}_\alpha(0, g)(x) = L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x)).$$

Define $w(x) = L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(x))$. Clearly $w(x) \geq 0$. Moreover, the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4 are satisfied with $\rho = 0$. Consequently, it follows that there exists $\hat{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ such that for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^{\hat{U}} & \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} \left[f(X(s), \hat{u}(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) \right] ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{t \wedge T_m} e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), \hat{u}_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ & \leq h(x). \end{aligned}$$

From assumption 2.4 (which implies that $T_m \rightarrow \infty$ $P^{\hat{U}}$ a.s.), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^{\hat{U}} & \left[\int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} \left[f(X(s), \hat{u}(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) \right] ds \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} r(X(s-), \hat{u}_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ & \leq h(x), \end{aligned}$$

and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow \infty$ we obtain that $h(x) \geq \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x)$. $\square$

Proposition 7.4 *We have that $v(x) = \mathcal{W}v(x)$.*

Proof: Let us show first that $v(x) \leq \mathcal{W}v(x)$. By using the definition of $\mathcal{W}$ we have for any $\Upsilon \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ that

$$v_{m+1}(x) \leq L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + G_\alpha v_m(x, \Upsilon).$$

Taking the limit as $m \uparrow \infty$ and from the monotone convergence theorem we get that

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} v_{m+1}(x) \leq L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} G_\alpha v_m(x, \Upsilon) \\ &= L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + G_\alpha v(x, \Upsilon) \end{aligned}$$

showing that $v(x) \leq \mathcal{W}v(x)$. From Proposition 7.1, there exists for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_\phi^m \in \mathcal{S}_V$ such that

$$\mathcal{W}v_m(x) = L_\alpha f(x, u_\phi^m(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, u_\phi^m(x)) + G_\alpha v_m(x, u_\phi^m(x)). \quad (33)$$

Fix $x \in E$. Since $u_\phi^m(x) \in \mathbb{V}(x) \subset \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ and $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ is compact we can find a further subsequence, still written as $u_\phi^m(x)$ for notational simplicity, such that $u_\phi^m(x) \rightarrow \hat{\Theta} \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$. From Proposition 5.7,

$$\begin{aligned} v(x) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} v_{m+1}(x) \\ &= \underline{\lim}_{m \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ L_\alpha f(x, u_\phi^m(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, u_\phi^m(x)) + G_\alpha v_m(x, u_\phi^m(x)) \right\} \\ &\geq L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Theta}) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Theta}) + G_\alpha v(x, \hat{\Theta}) \geq \mathcal{R}_\alpha(0, g)(x) = \mathcal{W}v(x), \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

giving the result. $\square$

Finally we have the following theorem characterizing the optimality equation for the discounted optimal control problem (5) and showing the convergence of the truncated problems.

Theorem 7.5 *We have that $v_n \uparrow \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha$ and $\mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x) = \mathcal{W}\mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x)$.*

Proof: All we need to show is that $\mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x) \leq v(x)$. But this is immediate from Propositions 7.4 and 7.3. $\square$

8 The vanishing approach

In general it is hard to obtain a solution for the discrete-time optimality equation (see equation (14)). A common approach is to deal with an optimality inequality of the kind $h \geq \mathcal{T}(\rho, h)$. We present sufficient conditions for the existence of a solution for this inequality, using the so-called vanishing discount approach (see Theorem 8.5). Combining this result with the connection between the integro-differential equation and the discrete-time equation we obtain our final main result that shows the existence of an ordinary optimal feedback control for the long run average cost (see Theorem 8.5). First we have the following result, which traces a parallel with the Abelian Theorem (see [16]).

Proposition 8.1 *We have that $\overline{\lim}_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \alpha \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x) \leq \mathcal{J}_A(x)$.*

Proof: See Theorem 1, chapter 5 in [24]. $\square$

We shall add the following assumptions for the discounted problems:

Assumption 8.2 *There exists a state $x_0 \in E$, numbers $\beta > 0$, $C \geq 0$, $K_h \geq 0$, and a nonnegative function $b(\cdot)$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $\alpha \in (0, \beta]$, $\rho_\alpha \leq C$, where $\rho_\alpha = \alpha \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x_0)$ and $-K_h \leq h_\alpha(x) \leq b(x)$ where $h_\alpha(x) = \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x) - \mathcal{J}_D^\alpha(x_0)$.*

We have the following propositions:

Proposition 8.3 *There exists a decreasing sequence of positive numbers $\alpha_k \downarrow 0$ such that $\rho_{\alpha_k} \rightarrow \rho$ and for all $x \in E$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k \mathcal{J}^{\alpha_k}(x) = \rho$.*

Proof: See Lemma in [16], page 88. $\square$

Proposition 8.4 *Set $h = \varliminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_{\alpha_k}$. Then for all $x \in E$, $h(x) \geq -K_h$ and $h(x) \geq \mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x)$.*

Proof: From Proposition 7.1 and Theorem 7.5 we have that the following equation is satisfied for each $\alpha > 0$ and $x \in E$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_\alpha(x) &= \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho_\alpha, h_\alpha)(x) \\ &= -\rho_\alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, u_\phi^\alpha(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, u_\phi^\alpha(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, u_\phi^\alpha(x)) + G_\alpha h_\alpha(x, u_\phi^\alpha(x)), \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

for $u_\phi^\alpha \in \mathcal{S}_V$.

For $x \in E$ fixed and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x) \in \mathbb{V}(x) \subset \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ and since $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ is compact we can find a further subsequence, still written as $u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x)$ for notational simplicity, such that $u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x) \rightarrow \hat{\Theta} \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$. Combining Proposition 5.7 and equation (35),

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &= \varliminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} h_{\alpha_k}(x) \\ &= \varliminf_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ -\rho_{\alpha_k} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha_k}(x, u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x)) + L_{\alpha_k} f(x, u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x)) + H_{\alpha_k} r(x, u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x)) + G_{\alpha_k} h_{\alpha_k}(x, u_\phi^{\alpha_k}(x)) \right\} \\ &\geq -\rho \mathcal{L}(x, \hat{\Theta}) + L f(x, \hat{\Theta}) + H r(x, \hat{\Theta}) + G h(x, \hat{\Theta}). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

Therefore, from Theorem 6.4, it follows that

$$h(x) \geq \mathcal{R}(\rho, h)(x) = \mathcal{T}(\rho, h)(x)$$

showing the result. $\square$

Our final result establishes the existence of an optimal control strategy for the long run average cost problem.

Let h and ρ be as in Propositions 8.3 and 8.4, and $w = \mathcal{T}(\rho, h)$.

Theorem 8.5 $\widehat{U}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{U}$ as defined in D.3) of Definition 6.1 is such that

$$\rho = \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{A}(x) = \mathcal{A}(\widehat{U}_\phi(w, h), x).$$

Proof: Combining Theorem 6.4 and Proposition 8.4, we obtain that the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4 are satisfied for $\alpha = 0$. Consequently, setting for simplicity $\widehat{U} = \widehat{U}_\phi(w, h)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^{\widehat{U}} \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_m} \left[f(X(s), \hat{u}(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) \right] ds + \int_0^{t \wedge T_m} r(X(s-), \hat{u}_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ + E_{(x,k)}^{\widehat{U}} [w(X(t \wedge T_m))] \leq E_{(x,k)}^{\widehat{U}} [\rho[t \wedge T_m]] + w(x). \end{aligned}$$

Combining Proposition 8.4 and assumption 5.5, we obtain that $w(x) \geq -\rho K_\xi - K_h$. Moreover, we have, from assumption 2.4 that $T_m \rightarrow \infty$ $P^{\widehat{U}}$ a.s. . Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^{\widehat{U}} \left[\int_0^t \left[f(X(s), \hat{u}(N(s), Z(s), \tau(s))) \right] ds + \int_0^t r(X(s-), \hat{u}_\partial(N(s), X(s-))) dp^*(s) \right] \\ \leq \rho t + \rho K_\xi + K_h + w(x), \end{aligned}$$

showing that $\rho \geq \mathcal{A}(\widehat{U}, x)$. From Proposition 8.1 and Proposition 8.3, we have $\rho \leq \mathcal{J}_\mathcal{A}(x)$ completing the proof. $\square$

9 Appendix

In this appendix we present several technical results required throughout the paper.

9.1 Proofs of the results of section 3

We start with the proof of Proposition 3.3.

Proof of Proposition 3.3: Let $\{x_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a convergent sequence in E with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x_n = x$, $\mu \in \mathcal{V}^r(x)$ and $(\bar{\mu}_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathcal{V}^r(x_n)$. Define the sequence $(\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{V}^r$ by

$$\mu_n(t, F) \doteq \frac{1}{\alpha(n, t)} \left[\frac{1}{n} \bar{\mu}_n(t, F) + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \mu(t, F \cap \mathbb{U}(\phi(x_n, t))) \right],$$

where $(t, F) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{U})$, and $\alpha(n, t) = \frac{1}{n} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{n}\right) \mu(t, \mathbb{U}(\phi(x_n, t)))$.

Clearly, we have that $\mu_n \in \mathcal{V}^r(x_n)$. Moreover, by using the hypothesis it is easy to check that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}} g(t, u) \mu_n(t, du) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}} g(t, u) \mu(t, du) dt,$$

for all $g \in L^1(\mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}))$. Therefore, from Proposition D.2 in [16] the multifunction $x \in E \rightarrow \mathcal{V}^r(x) \subset \mathcal{V}^r$ is lower semicontinuous. From Corollary III.3 in [3], this multifunction is measurable and so from Proposition D.4 in [16] $\{(x, \mu) : \mu \in \mathcal{V}^r(x), x \in E\} \in \mathcal{B}(E) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{V}^r)$. Finally, by using assumption 2.2 it can be shown easily that $\mathcal{K} \doteq \{(x, \Theta) : \Theta \in \mathbb{V}^r(x), x \in E\} \in \mathcal{B}(E) \times \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{V}^r)$, showing the result. $\square$

We present next the proof of Proposition 3.4. First we need the following lemma.

Lemma 9.1 *Let $h \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{U})^+$. Then the mapping*

$$(t, x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}} h(t, x, \mu, s, u) \mu(s, du) ds \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$ -measurable.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the class of functions $h \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{U})$ such that the mapping

$$(t, x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-s} \int_{\mathbb{U}} h(t, x, \mu, s, u) \mu(s, du) ds \in \mathbb{R}$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$ -measurable. This set is closed relative to addition, multiplication by constants and bounded pointwise passage to the limit. Consider the class $\mathcal{C}$ of functions h such that $h = h_1 h_2$ with $h_1 = \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$ and $h_2 = \mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{U})$. Then from Lemma A.3 in [13], $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{H}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}$ is closed relative to multiplication. Applying Theorem T20 in [21], it follows that $\mathcal{H}$ contains $\mathbb{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{U})$. Consider $g \in \mathbb{M}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{U})^+$ and define $g_k(t, x, \mu, s, u) = (e^s g(t, x, \mu, s, u)) \wedge k$. Therefore the mapping

$$(t, x, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r \rightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-s} \int_{\mathbb{U}} g_k(t, x, \mu, s, u) \mu(s, du) ds \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

is $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$ -measurable. By using the monotone convergence theorem, it follows

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} e^{-s} \int_{\mathbb{U}} g_k(t, x, \mu, s, u) \mu(s, du) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{U}} g(t, x, \mu, s, u) \mu(s, du) ds,$$

showing the result. $\square$

Proof of Proposition 3.4: Applying Lemma 9.1 to $h(t, x, \mu, s, u) = I_{\{s \leq t\}} \lambda(\phi(x, s), u)$ implies that the mapping $\Lambda^\mu(x, t)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r$ with value in $\mathbb{R}$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$. There is no loss of generality in assuming that g is positive. Clearly, $Qg(\cdot, \cdot)$ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}(\overline{E} \times \mathbb{U})$.

Therefore, for the function $h(t, x, \mu, s, u) = I_{\{s \leq t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} \lambda(\phi(x, s), u) Qg(\phi(x, s), u)$, Lemma 9.1 shows that the mapping

$$(x, \mu) \in E \times \mathcal{V}^r \rightarrow \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} \lambda Qg(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

is $\mathcal{B}(E \times \mathcal{V}^r)$ -measurable. Moreover, the mapping

$$(x, \mu, u) \in E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{U} \rightarrow e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^\mu(x, t_*(x))} Qg(\phi(x, t_*(x)), u) \in \mathbb{R}_+$$

is clearly $\mathcal{B}(E \times \mathcal{V}^r \times \mathbb{U})$ -measurable. Consequently, it follows that $G_\alpha g(x, \Theta)$ defined on $E \times \mathbb{V}^r$ with value in $\mathbb{R}$ is $\mathcal{B}(E \times \mathbb{V}^r)$ -measurable. By using the same arguments, the same property can be shown for the mappings $L_\alpha w_1(x, \Theta)$, and $H_\alpha w_2(x, \Theta)$. $\square$

9.2 Proofs of the results of section 4

The next lemma applies the semi-group property of the flow ϕ (see equation (1)) into the operators G_α , L_α , and H_α (defined in equations (9), (10), and (11)). Recall also the definition of $[\Theta]_t$ in (8).

Lemma 9.2 *For any $\alpha \geq 0$, $x \in E$, $t \in [0, t_*(x))$, $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$, and $g \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ bounded from below, we have that*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} ds + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\phi(x, t), [\Theta]_t), \\ L_\alpha f(x, \Theta) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} f(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} L_\alpha f(\phi(x, t), [\Theta]_t), \\ H_\alpha r(x, \Theta) &= e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} H_\alpha r(\phi(x, t), [\Theta]_t), \\ G_\alpha g(x, \Theta) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} \lambda Q g(\phi(x, s), \mu(s)) ds + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} G_\alpha g(\phi(x, t), [\Theta]_t).\end{aligned}\tag{37}$$

Proof: For any $x \in E$, and $\Theta = (\mu, \mu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}^r(x)$, by using the semi-group property of ϕ , we have for $t + s < t_*(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda^\mu(x, t + s) &= \int_0^t \lambda(\phi(x, \theta), \mu(\ell)) d\ell + \int_t^{t+s} \lambda(\phi(x, \theta), \mu(\ell)) d\ell \\ &= \Lambda^\mu(x, t) + \int_0^s \lambda(\phi(\phi(x, t), \theta), \mu(\ell + t)) d\ell.\end{aligned}$$

Remark that $t_*(x) - t = t_*(\phi(x, t))$. Consequently, combining the previous equation and Definition 3.1, we obtain for $t \in [0, t_*(x))$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} ds + \int_0^{t_*(\phi(x, t))} e^{-\alpha(t+s) - \Lambda^\mu(x, t+s)} ds, \\ &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} ds + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} \int_0^{t_*(\phi(x, t))} e^{-\alpha s - \int_0^s \lambda(\phi(\phi(x, t), \ell), \mu(\ell + t)) d\ell} ds, \\ &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\mu(x, s)} ds + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\phi(x, t), [\Theta]_t).\end{aligned}$$

showing equation (37). The other equalities can be obtained by using similar arguments. $\square$

We present next the proof of Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Proposition 4.2: From Lemma 9.2, it follows that for any $x \in E$, $t \in [0, t_*(x))$, and $\Upsilon = (\nu, \nu_\partial) \in \mathbb{V}(x)$

$$\begin{aligned}& -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Upsilon) + L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + G_\alpha h(x, \Upsilon) \\ &= e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\nu(x, t)} \left[-\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\phi(x, t), [\Upsilon]_t) + L_\alpha f(\phi(x, t), [\Upsilon]_t) + H_\alpha r(\phi(x, t), [\Upsilon]_t) + G_\alpha h(\phi(x, t), [\Upsilon]_t) \right] \\ &+ \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^\nu(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) Q h(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) \right] ds.\end{aligned}\tag{38}$$

Notice now that we must have

$$\begin{aligned}w(\phi(x, t)) &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(\phi(x, t), [\hat{\Gamma}(x)]_t) + L_\alpha f(\phi(x, t), [\hat{\Gamma}(x)]_t) + H_\alpha r(\phi(x, t), [\hat{\Gamma}(x)]_t) \\ &+ G_\alpha h(\phi(x, t), [\hat{\Gamma}(x)]_t)\end{aligned}\tag{39}$$

otherwise that would contradict the fact that the infimum is reached in equation (17) for $\hat{\Gamma}(x)$. Consequently, by taking $\Upsilon = \hat{\Gamma}(x)$ in equation (38) we obtain equation (19).

From assumption 2.3, we have that for all $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$, $e^{-\Lambda^{\hat{\gamma}(x)}(x,t)} > 0$ and so equation (19) implies that for all $x \in E$, $w(\phi(x, t))$ is absolutely continuous on $[0, t_*(x))$. Since there exists a constant $K_h \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $-K_h \leq h$, it is easy to obtain

$$\int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\gamma}(x)}(x,s)} [-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\gamma}(x, s)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\gamma}(x, s))] ds \leq w(x) + K_h.$$

Consequently, if $t_*(x) < \infty$, by using assumption 2.3 the limit of $w(\phi(x, t))$ as $t \rightarrow t_*(x)$ exists in $\mathbb{R}$, showing that $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$.

Let $\nu \in \mathcal{V}(x)$. Define $\tilde{\nu}$ by $\tilde{\nu}(s) = I_{[0,t]}(s)\nu(s) + I_{[t,\infty]}(s)\hat{\gamma}(x, s)$. Then $\tilde{\nu} \in \mathcal{V}(x)$ and Υ defined by $(\tilde{\nu}(x), \hat{\gamma}_{\partial}(x))$ belongs to $\mathbb{V}(x)$ and satisfies $[\Upsilon]_t = [\hat{\Gamma}]_t$. Consequently, combining (17), (38) and (39), it follows that for all $\nu \in \mathcal{V}(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &\leq -\rho \mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(x, \Upsilon) + L_{\alpha} f(x, \Upsilon) + H_{\alpha} r(x, \Upsilon) + G_{\alpha} h(x, \Upsilon) \\ &= e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\nu}(x,t)} w(\phi(x, t)) + \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\nu}(x,s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) Qh(\phi(x, s), \nu(s)) \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Now from the previous equation and (19), we obtain equation (20). $\square$

We present next the proof of Proposition 4.3.

Proof of Proposition 4.3: Set $w = \mathcal{T}_{\alpha}(\rho, h)$. By hypothesis, w is bounded from below, and so $J_m^U(t, x, k)$ is well defined. For $U = (u, u_{\partial}) \in \mathcal{U}$, defined for $\hat{y} = (x, z, s, n) \in \hat{E}$, $\hat{f}^U(\hat{y}) = f(x, u(n, z, s))$, $\hat{r}^U(\hat{y}) = r(x, u_{\partial}(n, z))$, $\hat{h}(\hat{y}) = h(x)$, $\hat{w}(\hat{y}) = w(x)$, and for $t \in [0, t_*(x)]$ $\hat{\Lambda}^U(y, t) = \Lambda^U(x, n, t)$. Clearly, we have that $J_0^U(t, x, k) = w(x) \geq h(x)$ for all $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$. Now assume that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $J_m^U(t, x, k) \geq h(x)$ for all $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$. Define $\hat{x} = (x, x, 0, k)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) &= E_{(x,k)}^U \left[I_{\{t < T_1\}} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} [\hat{f}^U(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] ds + e^{-\alpha t} \hat{w}(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad + I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} \left(\int_0^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} [\hat{f}^U(\hat{X}^U(s)) - \rho] ds + \int_0^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} \hat{r}^U(\hat{X}^U(s-)) dp^*(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + e^{-\alpha t \wedge T_{m+1}} \hat{w}(\hat{X}^U(t \wedge T_{m+1})) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) &= E_{(x,k)}^U \left[I_{\{t < T_1\}} \left(\int_0^t e^{-\alpha s} [\hat{f}^U(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] ds + e^{-\alpha t} \hat{w}(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad + I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} \left(\int_0^{T_1} e^{-\alpha s} [\hat{f}^U(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] ds + I_{\{T_1 = t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t_*(x)} \hat{r}^U(\hat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) \right) \\ &\quad + I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} \left(\int_{T_1}^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} [\hat{f}^U(\hat{X}^U(s)) - \rho] ds + \int_{T_1}^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} \hat{r}^U(\hat{X}^U(s-)) dp^*(s) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + e^{-\alpha t \wedge T_{m+1}} \hat{w}(\hat{X}^U(t \wedge T_{m+1})) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

However, by using the strong Markov property of the process $\{\widehat{X}^U(t)\}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} e^{-\alpha T_1} J_m^U(t - T_1, \widehat{X}_1^U, k + 1) &= E_{(x,k)}^U \left[I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} \left(\int_{T_1}^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} [\widehat{f}^U(\widehat{X}^U(s)) - \rho] ds \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_{T_1}^{t \wedge T_{m+1}} e^{-\alpha s} \widehat{r}^U(\widehat{X}^U(s-)) dp^*(s) + e^{-\alpha t \wedge T_{m+1}} \widehat{w}(\widehat{X}^U(t \wedge T_{m+1})) \right) | \mathcal{F}_{T_1}^{\widehat{X}^U} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

Combining equations (40) and (41), and the fact that $I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} J_m^U(t - T_1, \widehat{X}_1^U, k + 1) \geq I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} \widehat{h}(\widehat{X}_1^U)$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) &\geq E_{(x,k)}^U \left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_1} e^{-\alpha s} [\widehat{f}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] ds + I_{\{t < T_1\}} e^{-\alpha t} \widehat{w}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + I_{\{t \geq T_1 = t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t_*(x)} \widehat{r}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) + I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} e^{-\alpha T_1} \widehat{h}(\widehat{X}_1^U) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

However,

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^U &\left[\int_0^{t \wedge T_1} e^{-\alpha s} [\widehat{f}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] ds + I_{\{t < T_1\}} e^{-\alpha t} \widehat{w}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)) \right] \\ &= \int_0^{t \wedge t_*(x)} [\widehat{f}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho] e^{-\alpha s - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, s)} ds + I_{\{t < t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, t)} \widehat{w}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E_{(x,k)}^U &\left[I_{\{t \geq T_1\}} e^{-\alpha T_1} \widehat{h}(\widehat{X}_1^U) + I_{\{t \geq T_1 = t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t_*(x)} \widehat{r}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) \right] \\ &= e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, t_*(x))} \widehat{r}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) I_{\{t \geq t_*(x)\}} + \int_0^{t \wedge t_*(x)} \widehat{Q}^U \widehat{h}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) \widehat{\lambda}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) e^{-\alpha s - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, s)} ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, t_*(x))} \widehat{Q}^U \widehat{h}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) I_{\{t \geq t_*(x)\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Combining equations (42)-(44), it follows that for $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$

$$\begin{aligned} J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) &\geq \int_0^{t \wedge t_*(x)} [\widehat{f}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) - \rho + \widehat{Q}^U \widehat{h}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s)) \widehat{\lambda}^U(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, s))] e^{-\alpha s - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, s)} ds \\ &\quad + I_{\{t \geq t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, t_*(x))} [\widehat{Q}^U \widehat{h}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x))) + \widehat{r}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t_*(x)))] \\ &\quad + I_{\{t < t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t - \widehat{\Lambda}^U(\hat{x}, t)} \widehat{w}(\widehat{\phi}(\hat{x}, t)) \\ &= \int_0^{t \wedge t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\nu_k}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) Qh(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) \right] ds \\ &\quad + I_{\{t \geq t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^{\nu_k}(x, t_*(x))} [Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), u_{\partial}(k, x)) + r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), u_{\partial}(k, x))] \\ &\quad + I_{\{t < t_*(x)\}} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\nu_k}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

with $\nu_k(\cdot) = u(k, x, \cdot)$. Clearly, $\nu_k(\cdot) \in \mathcal{V}(x)$. Now if $t < t_*(x)$, then by applying Proposition 4.2, it follows that $J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) \geq w(x) \geq h(x)$. If $t \geq t_*(x)$, then by defining $\Upsilon = (\nu_k, u_{\partial}(k, x)) \in \mathbb{V}(x)$

and by using equation (21) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
J_{m+1}^U(t, x, k) &\geq \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\nu_k}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) Qh(\phi(x, s), \nu_k(s)) \right] ds \\
&\quad + e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^{\nu_k}(x, t_*(x))} \left[Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), u_\partial(k, x)) + r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), u_\partial(k, x)) \right] \\
&= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Upsilon) + L_\alpha f(x, \Upsilon) + H_\alpha r(x, \Upsilon) + G_\alpha h(x, \Upsilon) \geq w(x) \geq h(x),
\end{aligned}$$

showing the result. $\square$

We present next the proof of Proposition 4.4.

Proof of Proposition 4.4: From Lemma A.3 in [13] and item (ii) of Lemma 3 in [25] it follows that the mapping $\hat{u}$ defined by $\hat{u}(n, x, t) = \hat{\gamma}(x, t)$ belongs $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{N} \times E \times \mathbb{R}_+; \mathbb{U})$ since $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\gamma}_\partial) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$. Clearly, $u(n, x, t) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))$. Moreover, $\hat{u}_\partial$ defined by $\hat{u}_\partial(n, x) = \hat{\gamma}_\partial(x)$ belongs $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{N} \times E; \mathbb{U})$ and satisfies $u_\partial(n, x) \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))$. Therefore, $\hat{U} = (\hat{u}, \hat{u}_\partial)$ belongs to $\mathcal{U}$.

Set $w = \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)$. It is easy to check that w is bounded from below, and so $J_m^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k)$ is well defined. Remark that $J_0^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) = w(x) \leq h(x)$ for all $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$. Now assume that for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $J_m^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) \leq h(x)$ for all $(t, x, k) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times E \times \mathbb{N}$, then by using this hypothesis, it follows that the inequalities in equations (42), (45) can be inverted for the control process given by $\hat{U}$. Consequently, if $t < t_*(x)$, the last statement of Proposition 4.2 implies $J_{m+1}^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) \leq w(x) \leq h(x)$. If $t \geq t_*(x)$, then

$$J_{m+1}^{\hat{U}}(t, x, k) \leq -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{\Upsilon}(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{\Gamma}(x)) = w(x) \leq h(x),$$

showing the desired result. $\square$

9.3 Proofs of the results of section 5

We present next the proof of Proposition 5.7.

Proof of Proposition 5.7:

Item a) For all $0 \leq t < t_*(x)$, if $t_*(x) = \infty$, and all $0 \leq t \leq t_*(x)$, if $t_*(x) < \infty$, we have from assumptions 2.3 and 5.1 that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), u) \mu_n(s, du) ds = \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), u) \mu(s, du) ds,$$

or, in other words,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t) = \Lambda^\mu(x, t).$$

From items a) and b) of assumption 5.5, we have $e^{-\alpha_n t - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t)} \leq e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds}$ and

$\int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} dt < \infty$. Consequently, by using the dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_{\alpha_n}(x, \Theta_n) = \int_0^{t_*(x)} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\alpha_n t - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t)} dt = \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} dt = \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta),$$

showing item a).

Item b) We have from assumption 5.2 that there exists a sequence of measurable functions $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $y \in \overline{E}$, $f_j(y, \cdot) \uparrow f(y, \cdot)$ and $f_j(y, \cdot) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}(y))$. We have for $(n, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $x \in E$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\alpha_n} f_j(x, \Theta_n) &= \int_0^{t_*(x)} [e^{-\alpha_n t - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t)} - e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)}] f_j(\phi(x, t), \mu_n(t)) dt \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} f_j(\phi(x, t), \mu_n(s)) dt. \end{aligned}$$

However, item a) of assumption 5.5 gives

$$|e^{-\alpha_n t - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t)} - e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)}| f_j(\phi(x, t), \mu_n(t)) \leq 2e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))} f(\phi(x, t), a).$$

By combining item c) of assumption 5.5 and the dominated convergence theorem we obtain

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{t_*(x)} [e^{-\alpha_n t - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t)} - e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)}] f_j(\phi(x, t), \mu_n(t)) dt = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n} f_j(x, \Theta_n) = \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^\mu(x, t)} f_j(\phi(x, t), \mu(s)) dt.$$

However, remark that $L_{\alpha_n} f(x, \Theta_n) \geq L_{\alpha_n} f_j(x, \Theta_n)$, and the result follows by using the monotone convergence theorem.

Item c) Let us consider first that $t_*(x) = \infty$. From item b) of assumption 5.5 and remark 5.6

$$e^{-\Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t_*(x))} \leq e^{-\int_0^{t_*(x)} \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} = 0, \text{ and } e^{-\Lambda^\mu(x, t_*(x))} \leq e^{-\int_0^{t_*(x)} \xi(\phi(x, s)) ds} = 0.$$

and the result follows immediately since $H_{\alpha_n} r(x, \Theta_n) = H r(x, \Theta) = 0$.

Suppose now that $t_*(x) < \infty$ and set $z = \phi(x, t_*(x))$. We have from assumption 5.3 that there exists a sequence of measurable functions $(r_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $y \in \partial E$, $r_j(y, \cdot) \uparrow r(y, \cdot)$ and $r_j(y, \cdot) \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{U}(y))$. Consequently, $r(z, \mu_{\partial, n}) \geq r_i(z, \mu_{\partial, n})$, and so $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r(z, \mu_{\partial, n}) \geq r_i(z, \mu_{\partial})$. From the monotone convergence theorem we obtain c).

Item d) First notice that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n} \lambda(x, \Theta_n) = L \lambda(x, \Theta). \quad (46)$$

Indeed, notice that $L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda + \alpha_n)(x, \Theta_n) = 1 - e^{-\alpha_n t_*(x) - \Lambda^{\mu_n}(x, t_*(x))}$. Considering first that $t_*(x) < \infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda)(x, \Theta_n) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda + \alpha_n)(x, \Theta_n) - \alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) \\ &= 1 - e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^\mu(x, t_*(x))} - \alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) \\ &= L(\lambda + \alpha)(x, \Theta) - \alpha \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta) = L \lambda(x, \Theta). \end{aligned}$$

If $t_*(x) = \infty$ then $1 = L_{\alpha_n} \lambda(x, \Theta_n) = L \lambda(x, \Theta)$, showing (46).

Set $\tilde{h}_{\alpha_k} = h_{\alpha_k} + K_h$, $\tilde{h} = h + K_h$ and $\tilde{g}_k = \inf_{j \geq k} \tilde{h}_{\alpha_j}$ (thus $\tilde{g}_k \uparrow \tilde{h}$ and $\tilde{g}_k \leq \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n}$ for $n \geq k$). By hypothesis, $\tilde{g}_k(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in E$. We have that $\tilde{g}_k$ is the limit of a nondecreasing sequence of

measurable bounded functions $\tilde{g}_{k,i} \in \mathbb{B}(E)$. Set $\lambda_m(y, a) = m \wedge \lambda(y, a)$. From assumptions 5.1 and 5.4, we have that for each k, i and m and $y \in E$, $\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i}(y, \cdot)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{U}(y)$. Assumption 5.5 and the fact that for each k, i , $\tilde{g}_{k,i}$ is bounded above by, say $M_{k,i}$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x,s)) ds} \sup_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x,t))} (\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i}(\phi(x,t), a)) dt \\ &\leq m M_{k,i} \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\int_0^t \xi(\phi(x,s)) ds} dt < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i})(y, a) \geq 0$ and is continuous in a we have from the proof of b) (replacing f by $\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i}$) that $\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i})(x, \Theta_n) \geq L(\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i})(x, \Theta)$, and thus, recalling that $\tilde{g}_{k,i} \leq \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n}$ for $n \geq k$ and $\lambda_m \leq \lambda$,

$$\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda Q \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n})(x, \Theta_n) \geq L_{\alpha}(\lambda_m Q \tilde{g}_{k,i})(x, \Theta).$$

From the monotone convergence theorem and taking the limit over m, i, k we get that

$$\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda Q \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n})(x, \Theta_n) \geq L_{\alpha}(\lambda Q \tilde{h})(x, \Theta). \quad (47)$$

Notice now that

$$L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda Q \tilde{h}_{\alpha_n})(x, \Theta_n) = L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda Q h_{\alpha_n})(x, \Theta_n) + K_h L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda)(x, \Theta_n)$$

and similarly

$$L_{\alpha}(\lambda Q \tilde{h}_{\alpha})(x, \Theta) = L_{\alpha}(\lambda Q h_{\alpha})(x, \Theta) + K_h L_{\alpha}(\lambda)(x, \Theta).$$

By combining (46) and (47) we get that $\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} L_{\alpha_n}(\lambda Q h_{\alpha_n})(x, \Theta_n) \geq L_{\alpha}(\lambda Q h)(x, \Theta)$. Using similar arguments as above and c) we can show that

$$\varliminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_{\alpha_n} h_{\alpha_n}(x, \Theta_n) \geq H h(x, \Theta).$$

completing the proof of d). □

9.4 Proofs of the results of section 6

We present first the proof of Proposition 6.3.

Proof of Proposition 6.3: From assumption 3.2 and Proposition 3.4, it follows that the mapping V defined on $\mathcal{K}$ by

$$V(x, \Theta) = -\rho \mathcal{L}_{\alpha}(x, \Theta) + L_{\alpha} f(x, \Theta) + H_{\alpha} r(x, \Theta) + G_{\alpha} h(x, \Theta)$$

is measurable. Moreover, by using Corollary 5.8 it follows that for all $x \in E$, $V(x, \cdot)$ is lower semicontinuous on $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$. Recalling that $\mathbb{V}^r(x)$ is a compact subset of $\mathbb{V}^r$ and by using Proposition D.5 in [16], we obtain that there exists $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r}$ such equation (25) is satisfied.

The rest of the proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 4.2 and it is, therefore, omitted. □

Before presenting the proof of Theorem 6.4 we need the following auxiliary results.

Lemma 9.3 Assume that $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$. Then there exists a function $\mathcal{X}(w)$ in $\mathbb{M}(E)$ such that for all $x \in E$, and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$

$$w(\phi(x, t)) - w(x) = \int_0^t \mathcal{X}(w)(\phi(x, s)) ds. \quad (48)$$

Proof: Define

$$\begin{aligned} w^+(x) &\doteq \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} n[w(\phi(x, t_*(x) \wedge \frac{1}{n+1})) - w(x)] \\ w^-(x) &\doteq \underline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow +\infty} n[w(\phi(x, t_*(x) \wedge \frac{1}{n+1})) - w(x)] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{w(\phi(x, t_*(x) \wedge \frac{1}{n+1}))\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a sequence in $\mathbb{M}(E)$, then $w^+(x)$ and $w^-(x)$ are Borel measurable functions from E into $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\} \cup \{-\infty\}$. Consequently, the set $\mathcal{D}_w \doteq \{x \in E : w^+(x) = w^-(x)\} \cap \{x \in E : w^+(x) \in \mathbb{R}\}$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}(E)$.

Define the function $\mathcal{X}(w)(x)$ by

$$\mathcal{X}(w)(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{dw(\phi(x, t))}{dt}|_{t>0}, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{D}_w, \\ g(x), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where g is any function in $\mathbb{M}(E)$.

Clearly $\mathcal{X}(w)$ belongs to $\mathbb{M}(E)$. Since $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$, there exists a set $T_x^w \in \mathcal{B}([0, t_*(x)))$ such that $\mu_{leb}((T_x^w)^c \cap [0, t_*(x))) = 0$ and $w(\phi(\cdot, x))$ admits derivatives in T_x^w . Consequently, for any $x \in E$, and $t_0 \in T_x^w$, we obtain that $\phi(x, t_0) \in \mathcal{D}_w$, and

$$\lim_{\substack{SS\epsilon \rightarrow 0 \\ SS\epsilon > 0}} \frac{1}{\epsilon} [w(\phi(x, t_0 + \epsilon)) - w(\phi(x, t_0))] = \frac{dw(\phi(\phi(x, t_0), t))}{dt}|_{t>0} = \mathcal{X}(w)(\phi(x, t_0)).$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{X}(w)$ satisfies (48) showing the result. $\square$

Lemma 9.4 For any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(x))$ and $x \in \overline{E}$, $\lambda(x, \mu) < \infty$.

Proof: From assumption 2.1, $\mathbb{U}(x)$ is a compact subspace of $\mathbb{U}$, and from assumption 5.1, $\lambda(x, \cdot) : \mathbb{U}(x) \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$ is continuous. Therefore there exists $\hat{a} \in \mathbb{U}(x)$ such that $\max_{a \in \mathbb{U}(x)} \lambda(x, a) = \lambda(x, \hat{a})$ and thus $0 \leq \lambda(x, \mu) = \int_{\mathbb{U}(x)} \lambda(x, a) \mu(da) \leq \lambda(x, \hat{a})$. $\square$

Lemma 9.5 Suppose that $h \in \mathbb{M}(E)$ is bounded from below by K_h . Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(x)} \left\{ f(x, a) + \lambda(x, a) Q(h)(x, a) - \lambda(x, a) w(x) \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(x))} \left\{ f(x, \mu) - \lambda(x, \mu) w(x) + \lambda Qh(x, \mu) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))} \{ r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), a) + Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), a) \} \\ &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x))))} \{ r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu) + Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu) \}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Proof: Set for simplicity, $\vartheta(x, a) = f(x, a) + \lambda(x, a)Q(h)(x, a) - \lambda(x, a)w(x)$. Notice that from Lemma 9.4, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(x))$, $\lambda(x, \mu) < \infty$ and thus, recalling that f and $h + K_h$ are positive,

$$\begin{aligned} f(x, \mu) - \lambda(x, \mu)w(x) + \lambda Qh(x, \mu) &= f(x, \mu) + \lambda Q(h + K_h)(x, \mu) - \lambda(x, \mu)(w(x) + K_h) = \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{U}(x)} (f(x, a) + \lambda(x, a)Q(h + K_h)(x, a) - \lambda(x, a)(w(x) + K_h)) \mu(da) = \int_{\mathbb{U}(x)} \vartheta(x, a) \mu(da). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

But as in Lemma 5.7 of [13], we have that

$$\inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(x)} \vartheta(x, a) = \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(x))} \int_{\mathbb{U}(x)} \vartheta(x, a) \mu(da). \quad (52)$$

Combining (51) and (52) we get (49). Similarly we have (50). $\square$

We present next the proof of Theorem 6.4.

Proof of Theorem 6.4: According to Proposition 6.3, there exists $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{V}^r}$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $t \in [0, t_*(x))$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)) - w(x) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \left[\rho - f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) \right] ds, \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

where $\hat{\Theta}(x) = (\hat{\mu}(x), \hat{\mu}_\partial(x))$. Since $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$, it follows from Lemma 9.3 that there exists a function $\mathcal{X}(w)$ in $\mathbb{M}(E)$ satisfying equation (48). Therefore, we obtain from equation (53) that

$$\mathcal{X}w(\phi(x, t)) - [\alpha + \lambda(\phi(x, t), \hat{\mu}(x, t))]w(\phi(x, t)) = -f(\phi(x, t), \hat{\mu}(x, t)) - \lambda Qh(\phi(x, t), \hat{\mu}(x, t)) + \rho,$$

$\eta - a.s.$ on $[0, t_*(x))$, implying that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathcal{X}w(\phi(x, t)) + \alpha w(\phi(x, t)) \\ & \geq \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t)))} \left\{ f(\phi(x, t), \mu) - \lambda(\phi(x, t), \mu)w(\phi(x, t)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, t), \mu) \right\} - \rho. \end{aligned}$$

However, remark that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t)))} \left\{ f(\phi(x, t), \mu) - \lambda(\phi(x, t), \mu)w(\phi(x, t)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, t), \mu) \right\} - \rho \\ & = \inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t))} \left\{ f(\phi(x, t), a) - \lambda(\phi(x, t), a)[w(\phi(x, t)) - Qh(\phi(x, t), a)] \right\} - \rho \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, by considering the measurable selector $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathbb{U}}$ given by $\bar{u} = \hat{u}(w, h)$ (see Definition 6.1, D1)), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\mathcal{X}w(\phi(x, t)) + \alpha w(x) \\ & \geq -\rho + f(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t))) - \lambda(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t)))[w(\phi(x, t)) - Qh(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t)))], \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

$\eta - a.s.$ on $[0, t_*(x))$. Let Ξ be the set in $\mathcal{B}([0, t_*(x)))$ such that the previous inequality is strict. If $\eta(\Xi) > 0$, then there would exist $t \in [0, t_*(x))$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) - e^{-(\alpha t + \bar{\Lambda}(x, t))} w(\phi(x, t)) &> \int_0^t e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \left[f(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s)))Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) - \rho \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}(x, t)$ denotes $\int_0^t \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) ds$. However, this would lead to a contradiction with equation (26). Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{X}w(\phi(x, t)) + \alpha w(\phi(x, t)) &= -\rho + f(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t))) \\ &\quad - \lambda(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t))) [w(\phi(x, t)) - Qh(\phi(x, t), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t)))], \end{aligned}$$

$\eta - a.s.$ on $[0, t_*(x))$. Consequently, for all $t \in [0, t_*(x))$ it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= e^{-(\alpha t + \bar{\Lambda}(x, t))} w(\phi(x, t)) + \int_0^t e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \left[f(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) - \rho \right] ds. \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

First consider the case in which $t_*(x) < \infty$. We obtain, by taking the limit as t tends to $t_*(x)$ in the previous equation, that the feedback measurable selector $\hat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ (see item D2) of Definition 6.1) satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= e^{-(\alpha t_*(x) + \bar{\Lambda}(x, t_*(x)))} w(\phi(x, t_*(x))) - \rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) ds. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Define the control $\Theta(x)$ by $(\hat{\mu}(x), \mu)$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x))))$. From equation (28), we obtain that

$$w(x) \leq -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \Theta(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \Theta(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \Theta(x)) + G_\alpha h(x, \Theta(x)),$$

and by using the definition of $\Theta(x)$ and $\hat{\Theta}(x)$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &\leq -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t_*(x))} [Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu) + r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu)]. \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

From equation (27), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) \right] ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $w \in \mathbb{M}^{ac}(E)$, this yields that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*(x)} \int_0^t e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \left[-\rho + f(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) + \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) \right] ds \\ &\quad + \lim_{t \rightarrow t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha t - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t)} w(\phi(x, t)) \\ &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{\Theta}(x)) + \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-\alpha s - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, s)} \lambda Qh(\phi(x, s), \hat{\mu}(x, s)) ds \\ &\quad + e^{-\alpha t_*(x) - \Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t_*(x))} w(\phi(x, t_*(x))). \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

From assumption 2.3, we have that $e^{-\Lambda^{\hat{\mu}(x)}(x, t_*(x))} > 0$. Therefore, combining equations (57), and (58), it gives that for all $x \in E$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x))))$

$$w(\phi(x, t_*(x))) \leq Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu) + r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu).$$

Clearly, by using equation (25), it can be claimed that the previous inequality becomes an equality for $\mu = \hat{\mu}_\partial(x)$, implying that

$$\begin{aligned} w(\phi(x, t_*(x))) &= \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x))))} \{r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu) + Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \mu)\} \\ &= \inf_{a \in \mathbb{U}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))} \{r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), a) + Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), a)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have that

$$w(\phi(x, t_*(x))) = r(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))) + Qh(\phi(x, t_*(x)), \bar{u}(\phi(x, t_*(x)))). \quad (59)$$

Combining equations (56) and (59), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)). \end{aligned}$$

Consider now the case in which $t_*(x) = \infty$. From assumption 5.5, we obtain that the limit when t tends to infinity of

$$\int_0^t e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \left[f(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) - \rho \right] ds.$$

exists in $\mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and that $w(\phi(x, t)) \geq -\rho K_\xi - K_h$ for all $t \in [0, +\infty)$. Therefore, by using equation (55) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &\geq -e^{-(\alpha t + \bar{\Lambda}(x, t))} [\rho K_\xi + K_h] + \int_0^t e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \left[f(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) - \rho \right] ds, \end{aligned}$$

and so, the feedback measurable selector $\hat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &\geq -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + \int_0^{t_*(x)} e^{-(\alpha s + \bar{\Lambda}(x, s))} \lambda(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) Qh(\phi(x, s), \bar{u}(\phi(x, s))) ds \\ &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} w(x) &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)). \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, since $\mathbb{V}(x) \subset \mathbb{V}^r(x)$ it follows that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) \leq \mathcal{T}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x)$. However, we have shown that $\hat{u}_\phi(w, h) \in \mathcal{S}_\mathbb{V}$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho, h)(x) &= -\rho \mathcal{L}_\alpha(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + L_\alpha f(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) + H_\alpha r(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)) \\ &\quad + G_\alpha h(x, \hat{u}_\phi(w, h)(x)), \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired result. $\square$

References

- [1] A. Almudevar. A dynamic programming algorithm for the optimal control of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM J. of Control and Optim.*, 40(2):525–539, 2001.
- [2] D.P. Bertsekas and S.E. Shreve. *Stochastic optimal control*, volume 139 of *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*. Academic Press Inc., New York, 1978. The discrete time case.
- [3] C. Castaing and M. Valadier. *Convex analysis and measurable multifunctions*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1977. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 580.
- [4] O.L.V. Costa. Average impulse control of piecewise deterministic processes. *IMA J. Math. Control Inform.*, 6(4):375–397, 1989.
- [5] O.L.V. Costa and F. Dufour. Stability and ergodicity of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 47(2):1053–1077, 2008.
- [6] M.H.A. Davis. Piecewise-deterministic Markov processes: A general class of non-diffusion stochastic models. *J.Royal Statistical Soc. (B)*, 46:353–388, 1984.
- [7] M.H.A. Davis. Control of piecewise-deterministic processes via discrete-time dynamic programming. In *Stochastic differential systems (Bad Honnef, 1985)*, volume 78 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Inform. Sci.*, pages 140–150. Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [8] M.H.A. Davis. *Markov Models and Optimization*. Chapman and Hall, London, 1993.
- [9] M.A.H. Dempster and J.J. Ye. Necessary and sufficient optimality conditions for control of piecewise deterministic processes. *Stochastic and Stochastics Reports*, 40:125–145, 1992.
- [10] M.A.H. Dempster and J.J. Ye. Generalized Bellman-Hamilton-Jacob optimality conditions for a control problem with boundary conditions. *Appl. Math. Optimization*, 33:211–225, 1996.
- [11] F. Dufour and O.L.V. Costa. Stability of piecewise-deterministic Markov processes. *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, 37(5):1483–1502 (electronic), 1999.
- [12] E.B. Dynkin and A.A. Yushkevich. *Controlled Markov processes*, volume 235 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979.
- [13] L. Forwick, M. Schäl, and M. Schmitz. Piecewise deterministic Markov control processes with feedback controls and unbounded costs. *Acta Appl. Math.*, 82(3):239–267, 2004.
- [14] D. Gatarek. Impulsive control of piecewise-deterministic processes with long run average cost. *Stochastics Stochastics Rep.*, 45(3-4):127–143, 1993.
- [15] X. Guo and Q. Zhu. Average optimality for markov decision processes in Borel spaces: A new condition and approach. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 43:318–334, 2006.
- [16] O. Hernández-Lerma and J.B. Lasserre. *Discrete-time Markov control processes*, volume 30 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996. Basic optimality criteria.
- [17] O. Hernández-Lerma and J.B. Lasserre. *Further topics on discrete-time Markov control processes*, volume 42 of *Applications of Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

- [18] A. Hordijk and F.A. Van der Duyn Schouten. Average optimal policies in Markov decision drift processes with applications to a queueing and a replacement model. *Adv. Appl. Probab.*, 15:274–303, 1983.
- [19] A. Hordijk and F.A. Van der Duyn Schouten. Discretization and weak convergence in Markov decision drift processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 9:112–141, 1984.
- [20] A. Hordijk and F.A. Van der Duyn Schouten. Markov decision drift processes: Conditions for optimality obtained by discretization. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 10:161–173, 1985.
- [21] P.A. Meyer. *Probabilités et potentiel*. Publications de l’Institut de Mathématique de l’Université de Strasbourg, No. XIV. Hermann, Paris, 1966.
- [22] M. Schäl. On piecewise deterministic Markov control processes: control of jumps and of risk processes in insurance. *Insurance Math. Econom.*, 22(1):75–91, 1998.
- [23] J. Warga. *Optimal control of differential and functional equations*. Academic Press, New York, 1972.
- [24] D.V. Widder. *The Laplace Transform*. Princeton Mathematical Series, v. 6. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1941.
- [25] A.A. Yushkevich. On reducing a jump controllable Markov model to a model with discrete time. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 25:58–69, 1980.
- [26] A.A. Yushkevich. Continuous-time Markov decision processes with intervention. *Stochastics*, 9:235–274, 1983.
- [27] A.A. Yushkevich. Bellman inequalities in Markov decision deterministic drift processes. *Stochastics*, 23:235–274, 1987.
- [28] A.A. Yushkevich. Verification theorems for Markov decision processes with controlled deterministic drift and gradual and impulsive controls. *Theory Probab. Appl.*, 34(3):474–496, 1989.
- [29] A.A. Yushkevich. The compactness of a policy space in dynamic programming via an extension theorem for Carathéodory functions. *Math. Oper. Res.*, 22(2):458–467, 1997.